

Davidson's article on typology in Hebrews is a condensation of material from his dissertation, *Typology in Scripture* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press 1981). He finds that "the sanctuary typology of Hebrews possesses unique vertical and cultic dimensions," which is evidence that "vertical sanctuary typology . . . is part of the fundamental biblical perspective on typology" (186).

Treyer studies whether the typology in Hebrews represents antithesis or correspondence. He concludes that, although all shadow-types by their very nature are limited, the correspondences are consistently affirmed rather than denied. "Therefore, it is incorrect to refer to the typology of Hebrews as antithetic or oppositional typology" (197).

The final chapter by Salom takes a theological approach to the book of Hebrews, covering much of the same ground encompassed by earlier chapters in an exegetical fashion. His general conclusion is a direct response to the initial question. The book of Hebrews does not deny the SDA doctrine concerning the two-phased ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary or any question involving time relative to this ministry, because it does not address the issue. The author of Hebrews had other concerns.

The book is well organized and very readable. At the beginning of each chapter, except the first, there is an editorial synopsis. Then follows an outline of the chapter. These editorial additions make the book easier to read. There are a number of mechanical errors throughout the book, but on the whole it seems well edited. The layout makes for a good visual impression and easy reading.

Issues in the Book of Hebrews is must reading for SDAs who wish or need to be informed regarding current representative SDA thinking on the book of Hebrews and its relation to the doctrine of the two-phase priestly ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. It is also recommended for others who would like another scholarly perspective on some of the key issues in the book of Hebrews.

Berrien Springs, MI 49103

EDWIN E. REYNOLDS

Mason, Rex. *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. ix + 325 pp. \$49.50.

The realization that the church has been increasingly excluded from public policy has quickened exegetical and theological interest in the postexilic period when Judaism was supposedly in a similar position of political impotence. Rex Mason, a lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament Studies at Oxford University, reflects this interest. Through his analysis of postexilic "addresses," Mason seeks "an illuminating window into the life,

beliefs, doubts, fears, and hopes of the post-exilic community of faith." He is especially interested in the cares and concerns of their spiritual mentors, who "left in their 'Scriptures' a vivid and living witness to their brave attempts to interpret the ways of God in difficult circumstances" (2).

Mason begins his analysis of postexilic hermeneutics with a careful translation and exegesis of first-person speeches in Chronicles (13-144). He argues that the Chronicler calls for a total and passive trust in Yahweh by appealing to Yahweh's activity in the past as the Davidic covenant and dynasty found their fulfillment in the temple and its cults: "the real purpose of God with the davidic dynasty was the temple which, by its proper upkeep and service, functioned as a place of encounter between God and His people" (131). In the process, Mason convincingly argues against von Rad's notion of the "Levitical sermon" and demonstrates that the addresses are generally neither Levitical nor sermons, though they may "reflect" postexilic "exegetical methods and homiletical practices" (144).

Mason further investigates thematic and rhetorical continuities and discontinuities with Chronicles in other postexilic literature. Mason argues that while Ezra-Nehemiah's speeches differ formally from Chronicles', they do share many common themes and rhetorical features. Haggai, Zechariah (1-8), and Malachi, despite their own individual styles and stronger eschatological interests, also share in the same general thematic and rhetorical world of the Chronicler. Mason thereby concludes that the various writers shared a common Second Temple homiletical tradition, while each individual writer shaped and applied this tradition in the "living process" of the ongoing life of the community (261).

Mason's attempt to provide a detailed analysis of Second Temple speeches and his nuanced account of both continuities and discontinuities within this material is praiseworthy. However, his conceptual vagueness calls into question the soundness of his conclusions. This is perhaps most seriously reflected in his notion of "preaching." While rightly rejecting the "Levitical sermon" as a category for the speeches, Mason nevertheless attempts to designate this material as produced by "preachers"—"those who preserved, developed, and taught the traditions which must have been becoming increasingly enshrined in Israel's 'Scripture'" (2). Yet, is an imperial decree (2 Chr 36:23; Ezra 1:2-4) in any way preaching? Do messages sent to opponents by Nehemiah (Neh 6:3, 8, 11) have any relationship to homiletical activity? Are not prophets (e.g., Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi) somehow formally distinct from "preachers"? Mason introduces as his key category a concept vaguely defined and, at most, minimally relevant for much of the material he analyzes.

Furthermore, the formal characteristics which lead him to posit a common Second Temple homiletical tradition, such as quotations from a text of "Scripture," plays on words, allusions to past history, or rhetorical questions, are general and pervasive enough throughout the whole of the

Old Testament to render suspect the phrase "a common postexilic tradition." Would not most of the preexilic prophets also stand in this "postexilic" tradition? It would seem that more methodological rigor and conceptual precision are needed before one can convincingly and meaningfully speak of a Second Temple homiletical tradition.

Indeed, Mason's work raises a pressing question: Was there any real Jewish "homiletical activity" in the Persian period? While Mason explicitly links preaching to the practice of the Second Temple (258), one may recall that temples were primarily places of sacrifice, political administration, and economic storage and distribution. Our best evidence for Judean public assemblies is not in the temple, but in the public square (Ezra 10 and Neh 8). It is possible that homiletics developed more out of the discourses of the public forum than in a "religious" and cultic sphere. If so, the general exegetical search for a nonpolitical, "religious" reworking of postexilic Israelite traditions corresponding to the privatization of religion in our day may well be, at its very premise, a misguided effort.

St. Mary's College
Notre Dame, IN 46556-5001

JOHN M. WRIGHT

Stone, Michael Edward. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990. xxii + 496 pp. \$44.95.

The appearance of Michael Stone's commentary on 4 Ezra in the Hermeneia series of "biblical" commentaries testifies to the persistent scholarly interest in the intertestamental literature.

Stone is the right man for the job. Since receiving the assignment in 1965, he has published some 30 items with direct or indirect bearing on the book. His primary interests have been in the apocalyptic features of 4 Ezra and in its complex textual history, especially the Armenian tradition.

The format of the commentary follows standard Hermeneia style. After the discussion of introductory matters, the text is broken into sections following Stone's analysis. For each section, translation ("adapted from the RSV") and textual notes appear first, followed by "Form and Structure," "Function and Meaning," and "Commentary." The Commentary is truly verse-by-verse, with each verse listed separately. Even verses with no comment are clearly tagged with the line, "No commentary," a helpful touch.

Stone avoids conjectural reconstructions of the Hebrew original or the primary Greek translation, both of which are now lost. But he does provide detailed notes on the significant variants in the secondary and tertiary versions. While recognizing that the Latin and Syriac traditions are